



**Variable, but not free-weight, resistance exercise potentiates jump performance following a task-specific warm-up.**

Journal:	<i>Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports</i>
Manuscript ID	SJMSS-O-716-18.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-Nov-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Mina, Minas; University of Derby, School of Sport, Outdoor and Exercise Science Blazevich, Anthony; Edith Cowan University, Centre for Exercise and Sports Science Research Tsatalas, Themistoklis; University of Thessaly, Department of Physical Education and Sport Science Giakas, Giannis; University of Thessaly, Department of Physical Education and Sport Science Seitz, Laurent; Edith Cowan University, Centre for Exercise and Sports Science Research Kay, Anthony; The University of Northampton, Sport, Exercise & Life Sciences
Keywords:	elastic bands, PAP, conditioning activity, explosive strength, kinetics, kinematics

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4 1 TITLE  
5  
6 2 Variable, but not free-weight, resistance back squat exercise potentiates jump performance  
7  
8 3 following a comprehensive task-specific warm-up  
9  
10 4 AUTHORS  
11  
12 5 Minas A. Mina<sup>1</sup>, Anthony J. Blazevich<sup>2</sup>, Themistoklis Tsatalas<sup>3</sup>, Giannis Giakas<sup>3</sup>, Laurent B.  
13  
14 6 Seitz<sup>2</sup> & Anthony D. Kay<sup>4</sup>  
15  
16  
17 7  
18  
19 8 INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATIONS  
20  
21 9 <sup>1</sup>Sport, Outdoor and Exercise Science, University of Derby, Derby, United Kingdom  
22  
23 10 <sup>2</sup>Centre for Exercise and Sports Science Research, School of Medical & Health Sciences, Edith  
24  
25 11 Cowan University, Joondalup, Western Australia  
26  
27 12 <sup>3</sup>Department of Physical Education & Sport Science, University of Thessaly, Greece  
28  
29 13 <sup>4</sup>Sport, Exercise & Life Sciences, University of Northampton, Northampton, United Kingdom  
30  
31 14  
32  
33  
34  
35 15 RUNNING HEAD  
36  
37 16 Elastic band use improves jump performance  
38  
39  
40 17  
41  
42 18 CORRESPONDING AUTHOR  
43  
44 19 Minas A. Mina<sup>1</sup>  
45  
46 20 Sport, Outdoor and Exercise Science  
47  
48 21 University of Derby  
49  
50 22 Kedleston Road, Derby  
51  
52 23 DE22 1GB, United Kingdom.  
53  
54 24 Tel: +44 (0)7774014822.  
55  
56 25 Email: [M.Mina@derby.ac.uk](mailto:M.Mina@derby.ac.uk)  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ABSTRACT

Studies examining acute, high-speed movement performance enhancement following intense muscular contractions (frequently called ‘post-activation potentiation’; PAP) often impose a limited warm-up, compromising external validity. In the present study the effects on countermovement vertical jump (CMJ) performance of back squat exercises performed with or without elastic bands during warm-up were compared. After familiarization, fifteen active men visited the laboratory on two occasions under randomized, counterbalanced experimental squat warm-up conditions: (1) free-weight resistance (FWR) and (2) variable resistance (VR). After completing a comprehensive task-specific warm-up, three maximal CMJs were performed followed by three back squat repetitions completed at 85% of 1-RM using either FWR or VR. Three CMJs were then performed 30 s, 4 min, 8 min and 12 min later. During CMJ trials, hip, knee and ankle joint kinematics, ground reaction force data and vastus medialis, vastus lateralis and gluteus maximus electromyograms (EMG) were recorded simultaneously using 3D motion analysis, force platform, and EMG techniques, respectively. No change in any variable occurred after FWR ( $p>0.05$ ). Significant increases ( $p<0.05$ ) were detected at all time points following VR in CMJ height (5.3-6.5%), peak power (4.4-5.9%), rate of force development (12.9-19.1%), peak concentric knee angular velocity (3.1-4.1%) and mean concentric vastus lateralis EMG activity (27.5-33.4%). The lack of effect of the free-weight conditioning contractions suggests that the comprehensive task-specific warm-up routine mitigated any further performance augmentation. However, the improved CMJ performance following the use of elastic bands is indicative that specific alterations in force-time properties of warm-up exercises may further improve performance.

**Keywords:** elastic bands, PAP, conditioning activity, explosive strength, kinetics, kinematics

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**INTRODUCTION**

Pre-exercise (i.e. warm-up) routines are typically designed to precondition the neuromuscular system to enhance performance and reduce injury risk during subsequent high-intensity physical activities.<sup>1-3</sup> Performing maximal or near-maximal muscular contractions during a warm-up routine are important as they can induce short-term increases in force production and physical performance<sup>4</sup> through a number of mechanisms including, but not limited to, increases in muscle temperature,<sup>5</sup> reductions in muscle thixotropy or viscosity,<sup>3</sup> increases in myofilament calcium sensitivity,<sup>6</sup> an increased neural drive (leading to higher-frequency motor unit discharge) and optimization of motor control strategies.<sup>7</sup> Such changes lead to an increased mechanical power output (i.e. above previous maximal voluntary capacity), a state often referred to as post-activation potentiation (PAP) but which may not be synonymous with ‘classic’ PAP, which refers to an increase in muscular force production during an electrically elicited (twitch) contraction.<sup>8</sup> Regardless of the mechanism, short-term improvements in performance (i.e. post-activation performance enhancements [PAPE])<sup>9</sup> are commonly reported following intense muscular contractions that have important implications for the design of warm-up strategies.

The acute augmentation of physical performance has been explored using different warm-up strategies including light muscle stretching, cycling, running and sub-maximal repetitions of the primary task<sup>10</sup> or no warm-up at all.<sup>8</sup> Consequently, a “comprehensive task-specific” warm-up (including progressively intense task-specific conditioning activities) is often not provided prior to the specific activity being tested. Although warm-up strategies adopted to potentiate muscular force production have been shown to enhance athletic performance following a conditioning activity, it is unclear whether the enhancement of athletic performance

75 observed is a consequence of acute neuromuscular alteration relating to the conditioning  
76 activity, or whether it simply reflects a standard warm-up itself.<sup>11</sup>

77  
78 Heavy resistance exercise has been shown to acutely potentiate muscle force output, at least  
79 when a comprehensive task-specific warm-up is not completed,<sup>2,8,12</sup> however force production  
80 can also be reduced as a result of fatigue or coordination interference (i.e. perseveration)  
81 processes, which may mask any potentiating effects.<sup>1</sup> Some studies have reported that vertical  
82 jump performance enhancements can be detected after only 20 s<sup>13</sup> and 90 s<sup>14</sup> following  
83 maximal isometric squats and heavy box squats, respectively. Findings from these studies are  
84 indicative that effects may be detected within the time course of “classic” PAP observed using  
85 muscle twitch examinations.<sup>8</sup> Nonetheless, a meta-analysis of the literature revealed that  
86 minimal performance enhancement was likely when the rest period was less than 2 min,  
87 whereas longer rest periods of 3-7 min were more beneficial.<sup>15</sup> The equivocal findings likely  
88 result from disparate study methodologies including types of conditioning activity (i.e.  
89 movement-pattern specificity), performance tasks, delay between the conditioning activity and  
90 performance testing, study participant characteristics (e.g. experienced/novice lifters) and  
91 warm-up performed, which limit our understanding of the potentiating effects of these warm-  
92 up strategies.

93  
94 The countermovement vertical jump (CMJ) task is commonly performed in sport but is also a  
95 model commonly used to test power and muscle function in clinical research environment.  
96 Various high-intensity exercise types have been performed before maximal CMJ tests  
97 including resistance-, plyometric-, and electrical muscle stimulation-based exercises.<sup>16,18</sup> The  
98 back squat exercise is a fundamental exercise for the development of lower-limb strength and  
99 power<sup>12</sup> and its use during a warm-up has been reported to improve subsequent functional

performance including CMJ height;<sup>1,4</sup> this enhancement is commonly attributed to the PAP effect. However, maximal voluntary muscle activity occurs only during a short period in the early ascending (concentric) phase, near the “sticking point” in successful maximal (1-RM) back squat attempts. The larger internal and smaller external moment arms developed at the hip and knee joints (resulting in a greater mechanical advantage) combined with the optimized force-length characteristics of lower-limb muscles, ensures that only a submaximal muscle activation is needed for successful completion of the remaining part of the lift.<sup>18</sup> Thus, theoretically, variations of the exercise that evoke a greater muscle activation throughout the lift could result in a greater warm-up (i.e. PAPE) effect and improve CMJ performance. A possible means to alter the loading characteristics of the squat lift is the use of elastic bands to reduce the external load in the deepest part of the squat while increasing external load when the joints are more extended, the internal moment arms are greater and optimal muscle lengths are achieved.<sup>18,19</sup> Previous studies comparing elastic bands to free-weight squats for muscle activities (EMG), kinematics and kinetics has shown significantly higher EMG, movement velocity, and external power in the first quarter of the eccentric phase and the last quarter of the concentric phase of the squat exercise when using elastic bands.<sup>19</sup> Accordingly, it has been found that preconditioning contractions using elastic bands significantly increased subsequent 1-RM squat test performance without detectable changes in knee extensor muscle activity or knee flexion angle, although eccentric and concentric velocities were reduced.<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, elastic bands can be used to increase resistance in ranges of motion where the muscles can produce the greatest relative force as well as unload the system where muscle forces are compromised, and thus allow a larger overall impulse to be produced. Given the possibility for higher muscle activation and greater total work done during the lift, it might be hypothesized that these conditions would allow for a greater potentiating effect.

125  
126 Individuals incorporating the use of elastic band-based strategies into a warm-up routine may  
127 observe an acute enhancement of performance, and thus benefit from a greater mechanical  
128 stimulus during training.<sup>2</sup> However, a common limitation in the literature is that minimal or  
129 no warm-up has been provided before imposing the conditioning activity<sup>8</sup> limiting the  
130 comprehensive applicability and external validity of the data. Therefore, the purpose of this  
131 study was to compare the influence of free-weight resistance (FWR) and variable resistance  
132 (VR; imposed through elastic bands) squat exercises following a task-specific comprehensive  
133 warm-up on subsequent CMJ performance at different post-conditioning time points (i.e. 30 s,  
134 4 min, 8 min, and 12 min). It was hypothesized that (i) FWR and VR would enhance  
135 subsequent CMJ performance; however the variation in resistance imposed by the elastic bands  
136 during the squat lift would (ii) further enhance subsequent CMJ performance, (iii) alter CMJ  
137 kinetic and kinematic parameters (i.e. peak power, peak eccentric kinetic energy, impulse- and  
138 time-based descent-to-ascent asymmetry indexes, vertical stiffness ( $K_{\text{vert}}$ ), rate of force  
139 development (RFD), hip, knee and ankle joint kinematics), and (iv) increase the muscle activity  
140 of the lower-limb extensor muscles more than squatting without elastic bands.

141

## 142 MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 143 Participants

144 Fifteen active men (age =  $21.7 \pm 1.1$  y, height =  $1.8 \pm 1.9$  m, mass =  $77.6 \pm 2.6$  kg) with  $\geq 5$  y  
145 experience with heavy weight training of varying levels (from regional to elite) and training  
146 backgrounds volunteered to participate after providing written informed consent and  
147 completing a pre-test medical questionnaire. The participants' training protocols involved  
148 resistance training, sprint running, power exercises, dynamic/explosive exercises, agility drills  
149 and other specific exercises relevant to their sports. The participants had no recent illness or

lower-limb injury, were instructed to maintain normal eating and drinking habits throughout the study, and avoided strenuous exercise and stimulant use at least 48 h prior to testing. Ethical approval was granted by the ethics committee at the University of Thessaly, Greece, with the study conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Effect size (ES) values (Cohen's *d*) were calculated from mean changes in variables (jump height, power, RFD and EMG) from previous studies using similar methods. To ensure an adequate population to reach statistical power (set at 0.8) was recruited, effect sizes were initially calculated from related research<sup>21-23</sup> for jump height (ES = 1.48), power (ES = 1.0), RFD (ES = 1.29), and EMG (ES = 1.2). To ensure an adequate sample, the measure with the smallest ES (power, 1.0) was used to calculate sample size. The analysis revealed that the initial sample size required for statistical power was 14; thus, considering the possibility of participant withdrawal and data loss, 18 participants were recruited with 15 participants completing the study.

**Protocol**

***Overview***

A randomized, cross-over design was implemented to compare CMJ performance following two warm-up conditions: free-weight resistance (FWR) or variable resistance (VR) back squat exercise. Participants completed a familiarization session one week prior to the two experimental sessions, each separated by 72 h and performed at the same time of the day. During familiarization, anthropometric characteristics were recorded, one-repetition maximum (1-RM) back squat load was determined, and the participants were familiarized with all experimental procedures. During experimental conditions, following the comprehensive task-specific warm-up (described later), the participants performed three pre-intervention CMJs followed by back squats at 85% of 1-RM using either FWR or VR warm-up. CMJ trials were then performed at 30 s, 4 min, 8 min and 12 min after the intervention. Peak power output,



peak eccentric kinetic energy, impulse- and time-based descent-to-ascent asymmetry indexes, peak normalized (to body weight)  $K_{\text{vert}}$  and RFD, peak knee flexion angle, peak eccentric and concentric knee angular velocities, peak and mean eccentric and concentric electromyograms (EMG; vastus lateralis (VL), vastus medialis (VM), gluteus maximus (Glut)), and jump height were measured during all CMJ trials (described later).

### ***Familiarization session and one-repetition (1-RM) squat lift test***

The 1-RM back squat protocol was adopted from Sheppard and Triplett et al.<sup>24</sup> Participants initially performed a 5 min cycling warm-up (Monark 874E, Varberg, Sweden) at 65 rpm with a 1-kg resistance load followed 2 min later by 2 sets of 10 back squat repetitions using an unloaded 20-kg Olympic bar. The participants then completed 8-10 repetitions of the squat lift exercise at 50% of their estimated 1-RM load before the load was increased by 20% for 3-5 repetitions, and by a further 20% for 2-3 repetitions with a 2 min rest between sets. The load was finally increased by 5% movements with 2-4 min rest between lifts until participants failed to complete the lift; the previous successful attempt was recorded as their 1-RM load. To ensure correct technique, participants were instructed to place the bar above the posterior deltoids at the base of the neck and position the feet shoulder width apart with the toes pointed slightly outward and attempt to squat to a position where the knee was flexed to  $\sim 90^\circ$  before returning to a standing position. This was visually assessed by an experienced, certified British Amateur Weight Lifting Association (BAWLA) spotter throughout all testing procedures to ensure correct technique and safety during the lifts, with participants receiving strong verbal encouragement to promote maximal effort.

### ***Comprehensive task-specific warm-up and countermovement jump trials***

1  
2  
3 199 During the experimental trials the participants performed a comprehensive task-specific warm-  
4  
5 200 up consisting of 5 min of cycling followed by five continuous unloaded squats (i.e. non-  
6  
7  
8 201 jumping) at a rhythm of 2 s/ 2 s (eccentric/concentric) and a further 5 squats at a rhythm of 1  
9  
10 202 s/ 1 s after a 30 s rest. After 20-s rest, five continuous CMJs were performed at ~70% of the  
11  
12 203 participants' perceived maximum and, after a further 30 s rest, maximal CMJs were performed  
13  
14 204 every 30 s until three consecutive jumps were within 3% of jump height (4-7 jumps were  
15  
16 205 performed in all trials). The CMJ was performed from a stationary upright standing position  
17  
18 206 with hands positioned on the hips, making a preliminary downward movement with the hips  
19  
20 207 and knees flexed, and immediately jumping vertically up as high possible.<sup>12</sup>  
21  
22  
23  
24 208  
25  
26 209 Two minutes after the completion of the warm-up, three maximal pre-intervention CMJ trials  
27  
28 210 were performed to establish baseline (i.e. after warm-up) performance. A conditioning set of  
29  
30 211 three repetitions of back squats at 85% of the previously determined 1-RM using either FWR  
31  
32 212 or VR (described later) was then performed before the participants completed three CMJs 30  
33  
34 213 s, 4 min, 8 min and 12 min (see Table 1) later with participants receiving verbal encouragement  
35  
36 214 to jump as high as possible. The post-intervention intervals were selected from previous data  
37  
38 215 describing the time-course of the performance augmentation (PAP) response.<sup>21,25</sup>  
39  
40  
41  
42 216  
43  
44  
45 217  
46  
47 218  
48

Table 1 about here

49 219 ***Conditioning activities: free-weight resistance (FWR) and variable resistance (VR)***  
50  
51 220 During the FWR condition, the load was adjusted to 85% of the previously determined 1-RM  
52  
53 221 load with the participants performing one set of three-repetition back squats. In the VR warm-  
54  
55 222 up condition, 35% of the total load was generated from band resistance. To ensure a similar  
56  
57 223 load of 85% 1-RM across FWR and VR conditions, mechanical properties of the bands were  
58  
59  
60

determined to allow the band resistance to generate 35% of the total load. Half of the band's resistance was subtracted from the total free-weight load to ensure the elastic bands did not have substantially different average resistance compared with the FWR condition, thus both the FWR and VR warm-up conditions were equalized, as previously reported.<sup>20,22</sup> The participants stood on a force platform with 85% 1-RM load to determine the combined load (kg), the bar was then unloaded to adjust the band tension. The elastic bands were anchored to the floor with custom-made weight stands and attached equidistant to the ends of the Olympic bar to ensure the participant's stability. The thickness and lengths of the elastic bands were adjusted so that: (i) the tension in the bands increased the ground reaction force (measured by force platform) by 35% of the 85% load when the participants were standing, but (ii) bands were slack in a full squatting position and thus provided no additional loading. The linear force-length properties of the bands ensured, therefore, that the average load during the lift equated to 35% of the total load. For example, a 100-kg load in the FWR condition would require 35-kg (35%) to be generated from the bands. Half of the 35-kg load (i.e. 17.5 kg) was removed from the bar with the 35-kg resistance added from the bands providing a total load of 117.5 kg in the standing position. As band tension reduced as the participant squats, 35 kg of load was removed leaving the 82.5 kg from the bar in the full squatted position. Thus, the average loading throughout the lift in this example is 100 kg, identical to the FWR condition whilst enabling 35% to be generated by band tension.

#### ***Kinetic and kinematic analyses***

Kinematic data were collected during the CMJs using a Vicon motion analysis system (T-Series, Oxford Metrics LTDA, Oxford, UK) with 10 cameras operating at 100 Hz surrounding two force platforms (Bertec, FP4060-10-2000, Bertec Corporation, Columbus, OH, USA). Ground reaction forces were sampled at 1000 Hz and time-synchronized with the Vicon system

1  
2  
3 249 (see Figure 1). The data were then filtered using Woltring's quantic spline algorithm<sup>26</sup> with a  
4  
5 250 mean squared error setting of 15 before running the Plug-In-Gait biomechanical model (Vicon  
6  
7 251 Plug-in-Gait, Oxford Metrics). The procedures identified by Davis et al.<sup>27</sup> were followed to  
8  
9 252 define Cardan angles and to reconstruct a system of embedded coordinates from the marker set  
10  
11 253 to 0° at the three joints of the lower extremities (hip, knee and ankle) in a standing position.  
12  
13 254 Lower-limb kinetic and kinematic data were captured by placing 16 reflective markers over the  
14  
15 255 pelvis, left and right thigh, left and right shank in a straight line, and the left and right foot at a  
16  
17 256 right angle to the leg. Data were analyzed using Vicon Nexus (v.2.3) software to determine  
18  
19 257 peak hip, knee and ankle flexion angle and angular velocity data during the pre- and post-  
20  
21 258 intervention CMJ trials (see Figure 1).  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 259  
27  
28 260 Figure 1 about here  
29  
30

31 261  
32  
33 262 All jumps were performed from the standing position with each foot in parallel on two force  
34  
35 263 platforms providing a separate yet time-synchronized measurement of the force data for each  
36  
37 264 leg. The participant's body weight was calculated by averaging the vertical force from each  
38  
39 265 platform when the participants were stationary. The initiation of the jump (i.e. the beginning  
40  
41 266 of the eccentric phase) was identified as the point when the ground reaction force (N) decreased  
42  
43 267 2 standard deviations (SD) below the mean baseline force. The vertical ground reaction force  
44  
45 268 was integrated using the trapezoid method during the eccentric and concentric phases of the  
46  
47 269 jump. The net impulse was calculated independently and summed from the left and right force  
48  
49 270 platforms. Ground reaction forces were directly quantified by integrating the applied force  
50  
51 271 over time (i.e. impulse), which is equivalent to the change in momentum of the body:  
52  
53  
54

55  
56 272 
$$J = \int F dt = \Delta p$$
  
57

58 273 where  $J$  = impulse,  $F$  = force,  $t$  = time and  $\Delta p$  = change in momentum.  
59  
60

274

275 The take-off velocity was determined from impulse by dividing by body mass, and the jump  
 276 height was calculated using standard equations for motion.<sup>28</sup> To calculate power, the impulse-  
 277 momentum approach was used. Since the force, mass and initial velocity conditions were  
 278 known, instantaneous velocity could be calculated. The instantaneous power was calculated  
 279 as force  $\times$  velocity and the peak values were determined for the propulsive phase of the CMJ:

280

$$V_{(0)} = 0$$

281

$$F(i)t = m(v_{(i+1)} - v_{(i)})$$

282

$$\Delta v = (F_{(i)}t)/m$$

283

$$P_{(i)} = F_{(i)} \times V_{(i)}$$

284 where  $F$  = force,  $t$  = 1/sampling frequency,  $m$  = mass of body, load,  $v$  = velocity, and  $P$  =  
 285 power.

286

287 The peak eccentric kinetic energy (KE) developed during the jumps was calculated as:

288

$$KE = \frac{1}{2}mv^2$$

289 where  $m$  is the participant's mass and  $v$  is the velocity of the countermovement phase.

290

291 The impulse-based asymmetry index was calculated by dividing the negative and positive  
 292 impulses, where the negative impulse describes the impulse that negatively accelerates the  
 293 body downwards and the positive impulse accelerates the body upwards. The index was  
 294 calculated to estimate the efficiency of the metabolic energy conversion into mechanical work  
 295 (i.e. storage of elastic energy during eccentric contraction) performed during the CMJ from the  
 296 force applied by the body to the ground<sup>29</sup> and subsequently released energy during the  
 297 concentric phase of the SSC. The time-based asymmetry index was calculated as the quotient  
 298 of times A + B, where  $A$  is the time from force first rising above 1 body weight to the peak

1  
2  
3 299 vertical force and  $B$  is the time from peak force until force drops below 1 body weight.  $K_{\text{vert}}$   
4  
5 300 was calculated by dividing the peak vertical ground reaction force by the maximal vertical  
6  
7 301 displacement of the center of mass during contact with the ground<sup>30</sup>  
8  
9

10 302 
$$K_{\text{vert}} = F_{\text{max}} / \Delta y$$

11  
12 303 where  $F_{\text{max}}$  = maximum vertical force, and  $\Delta y$  = maximum vertical displacement of the center  
13  
14 304 of mass. The vertical displacement was determined by the double integration of the vertical  
15  
16 305 force trace according to methods of Cavagna.<sup>31</sup>  
17  
18

19 306  
20  
21 307 The peak RFD (normalized to body weight) was calculated from the initiation of the jump (i.e.  
22  
23 308 first rise in force during the eccentric phase) using the average force-time curve with a 50-ms  
24  
25 309 time window.  
26  
27

28 310  
29  
30 311 ***Muscle activity (electromyography; EMG)***

31  
32 312 EMG data were collected wirelessly using a Myon MA-320 EMG system (Myon AG,  
33  
34 313 Schwarzenberg, Switzerland) from vastus lateralis (VL), vastus medialis (VM) and gluteus  
35  
36 314 maximus (Glut). The skin was shaved, abraded and cleansed with alcohol before bipolar  
37  
38 315 adhesive surface electrodes (Noraxon Dual Electrodes, Ag-AgCl, Noraxon USA, Inc,  
39  
40 316 Scottsdale, AZ) were placed over the muscle belly with an inter-electrode distance of 2 cm  
41  
42 317 according to SENIAM guidelines. EMG data were sampled at 2000 Hz and imported into  
43  
44 318 ProEMG software (version 4.1) and filtered using a Butterworth (20-500 Hz bandpass) filter  
45  
46 319 before using a symmetric moving root-mean-square algorithm with a 50-ms sampling window.  
47  
48 320 The Myon EMG software was integrated with an optimal tracking device for synchronization  
49  
50 321 between the systems (Vicon motion analysis system, Oxford, UK). The normalized EMG  
51  
52 322 amplitude during isometric squat lifts (% maximal voluntary contraction [MVC]) for each  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

muscle was used as a measure of neuromuscular activity during the jumps (see Figure 1), with peak and mean EMG activity recorded during the eccentric and concentric phases.

### **Data analyses**

All data were analyzed using SPSS statistical software (version 24.0; IBM, Chicago, IL, USA); all data are presented as mean  $\pm$  SE. Normal distribution was assessed using Shapiro-Wilks test; no significant difference ( $p > 0.05$ ) was detected in any variable indicating that all data sets were normally distributed. Separate multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) were used to compare (a) jump height and peak power, and (b) EMG. Where significant differences were detected, separate two-way repeated measures ANOVAs (time  $\times$  condition) were used to determine differences in (a) jump height, (b) peak power, (c) peak eccentric kinetic energy, (d) impulse- and time-based descent-to-ascent asymmetry indexes, (e) peak normalized RFD, (f) peak hip, knee and ankle flexion angle, (g) peak eccentric and concentric hip, knee and ankle angular velocities, (h) peak and mean eccentric and concentric EMG activities during CMJ trials. Significance was accepted at  $p < 0.05$  for all tests.

### **Reliability**

Reliability for all measures was determined during the pre-intervention vertical jumps from the VR and FWR warm-up conditions. No significant differences ( $p > 0.05$ ) were detected in any measure and high intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) calculated for jump height (0.95), peak power (0.98), peak eccentric kinetic energy (0.99), impulse- (0.96) and time-based (0.91) asymmetry indexes,  $K_{\text{vert}}$  (0.81), peak RFD to 50 ms (0.92), peak hip, knee and ankle flexion angle ranged from 0.67 to 0.96, peak angular velocities ranged from 0.76, 0.95, 0.85 to 0.85, 0.95 0.79 for hip, knee and ankle, respectively. ICCs for the EMG data ranged from 0.73 to 0.89, 0.85 to 0.92, 0.85 to 0.92 for VL, VM and Glut, respectively. Coefficients of variation



(CoV) expressed as a percentage of the mean were also calculated for jump height (8.0%), peak power (6.2%), peak eccentric kinetic energy (8.5%), impulse- (4.9%), and time-based (14.6%) asymmetry indexes,  $K_{\text{vert}}$  (8.7%), peak RFD to 50 ms (12.5%), peak hip, knee and ankle flexion angle ranged from 3.8% to 7.6%, peak angular velocities ranged from 5.6%, 5.2%, 14.8% to 5.0%, 3.4%, 6.3% for hip, knee and ankle, respectively. CoVs for EMG data 9.0% to 14.3%, 11.3% to 14.1%, 14.9% to 22% for VL, VM and Glut, respectively.

## RESULTS

In the FWR condition, no significant changes ( $p > 0.05$ ) were found in jump height (range =  $3.0 \pm 2.0$  % to  $4.9 \pm 2.2$ %) at any time point compared with pre-intervention data (see Figure 1). Also, no significant changes ( $p > 0.05$ ) were observed in peak power ( $0.1 \pm 2.4$ % to  $3.6 \pm 1.6$ %), peak eccentric kinetic energy ( $0.5 \pm 4.6$ % to  $4.9 \pm 3.6$ %), impulse- ( $0.6 \pm 1.6$ % to  $2.0 \pm 1.9$ %) and time-based ( $4.5 \pm 7.0$ % to  $14.8 \pm 8.4$ %) asymmetry indexes,  $K_{\text{vert}}$  ( $3.1 \pm 4.3$ % to  $5.8 \pm 4.1$ %) or peak normalized RFD ( $3.1 \pm 6.1$ % to  $11.8 \pm 8.4$ %) at any time point (see Table 2). No changes ( $p > 0.05$ ) were detected in peak eccentric hip ( $0.5 \pm 1.7$ % to  $2.6 \pm 1.9$ %), knee ( $0.5 \pm 2.1$ % to  $2.6 \pm 2.2$ %), ankle ( $2.2 \pm 5.4$ % to  $9.0 \pm 5.0$ %) or concentric hip ( $1.2 \pm 2.1$ % to  $3.7 \pm 2.0$ %), knee ( $0.5 \pm 1.7$ % to  $1.7 \pm 2.0$ %), ankle ( $1.4 \pm 2.1$ % to  $4.7 \pm 2.6$ %) angular velocities, or peak hip ( $1.5 \pm 1.3^\circ$  to  $3.4 \pm 1.2^\circ$ ), knee ( $0.1 \pm 1.2^\circ$  to  $1.7 \pm 1.9^\circ$ ), ankle ( $0.1 \pm 0.6^\circ$  to  $0.6 \pm 0.5^\circ$ ) flexion angle (see Table 3). Furthermore, no changes in peak or mean eccentric EMG eccentric activity ( $p > 0.05$ ) in VL (peak =  $2.4 \pm 3.8$ % to  $7.2 \pm 5.2$ %; mean =  $0.7 \pm 6.4$ % to  $7.3 \pm 5.7$ %), VM (peak =  $0.6 \pm 3.2$ % to  $8.3 \pm 5.0$ %; mean =  $8.9 \pm 4.5$ % to  $10.9 \pm 3.2$ %), Glut (peak =  $0.9 \pm 6.0$ % to  $8.7 \pm 3.8$ %; mean =  $2.3 \pm 6.0$ % to  $10.7 \pm 7.4$ %) or concentric EMG in VL (peak =  $0.4 \pm 10.3$ % to  $9.4 \pm 8.3$ %; mean =  $2.2 \pm 8.6$ % to  $7.0 \pm 6.9$ %), VM (peak =  $0.5 \pm 4.6$ % to  $7.1 \pm 5.2$ %; mean =  $1.2 \pm 7.1$ % to  $9.5 \pm 5.4$ %) or Glut (peak =  $1.3 \pm 5.7$ % to  $10.4 \pm 5.6$ %; mean =  $2.1 \pm 6.6$ % to  $8.3 \pm 8.9$ %) were detected (see Table 4).



373

374

Table 2 about here

375

Figure 2 about here

376

377 In the VR condition, significant increases ( $p < 0.05$ ) in CMJ height were detected at 30 s ( $5.9 \pm 1.2\%$ ), 4 min ( $5.6 \pm 1.8\%$ ), 8 min ( $6.5 \pm 2.6\%$ ) and 12 min ( $5.3 \pm 2.5\%$ ) time points compared  
 378  
 379 with pre-intervention data (see Figure 2). Significant increases ( $p < 0.05$ ) were also observed  
 380 in peak power at 30 s ( $4.7 \pm 1.2\%$ ), 4 min ( $5.9 \pm 1.3\%$ ), 8 min ( $4.4 \pm 1.7\%$ ) and 12 min ( $4.8 \pm 1.7\%$ ) time points compared to pre-intervention data. These changes in CMJ height and power  
 381  
 382 were also statistically different to FWR ( $p < 0.05$ ). Similarly, significant increases ( $p < 0.05$ )  
 383 were found in peak normalized RFD at 30 s ( $18.9 \pm 7.8\%$ ), 4 min ( $12.9 \pm 5.9\%$ ), 8 min ( $19.1 \pm 5.0\%$ ) and 12 min ( $16.0 \pm 8.1\%$ ) compared to pre-intervention data. However, no significant  
 384  
 385 change ( $p > 0.05$ ) in peak eccentric kinetic energy ( $0.4 \pm 4.8\%$  to  $5.2 \pm 4.8\%$ ) or impulse- ( $1.4 \pm 1.5\%$  to  $4.6 \pm 2.4\%$ ) or time-based ( $7.4 \pm 11.7\%$  to  $13.0 \pm 12.5\%$ ) asymmetry indexes,  $K_{\text{vert}}$   
 386  
 387 ( $6.6 \pm 4.5\%$  to  $8.9 \pm 3.7\%$ ) were found following the VR warm-up condition at any time point  
 388 (see Table 2).

389

390

Table 3 about here

391

392 No significant change in peak hip ( $1.3 \pm 1.3^\circ$  to  $1.9 \pm 1.5^\circ$ ), knee ( $0.9 \pm 2.9^\circ$  to  $4.1 \pm 3.0^\circ$ ),  
 393 ankle ( $0.9 \pm 0.4^\circ$  to  $1.4 \pm 0.7^\circ$ ) flexion angles were observed in VR at any time point. Similarly,  
 394 no changes ( $p > 0.05$ ) were found at any time point (see Table 3) in peak eccentric hip ( $0.2 \pm 2.2\%$  to  $2.5 \pm 2.2\%$ ), knee ( $0.04 \pm 1.7\%$  to  $2.6 \pm 2.5\%$ ), ankle ( $0.1 \pm 6.6\%$  to  $6.7 \pm 8.7\%$ ) or  
 395  
 396 concentric hip ( $1.5 \pm 2.4\%$  to  $3.6 \pm 2.1\%$ ) or ankle ( $1.1 \pm 2.0\%$  to  $3.5 \pm 2.1\%$ ) angular velocities  
 397 or peak or mean eccentric EMG amplitudes for VL (peak =  $0.5 \pm 4.3\%$  to  $3.1 \pm 4.3\%$ , mean =

1  
2  
3 398 4.9 ± 6.0% to 9.2 ± 6.5%), VM (peak = 2.1 ± 4.6% to 9.6 ± 4.0%, mean = 4.9 ± 5.4% to 6.7 ±  
4  
5 399 5.8%) or Glut (peak = 2.2 ± 6.3% to 4.6 ± 6.3%, mean = 3.5 ± 7.4% to 4.9 ± 6.5%). However,  
6  
7 400 a significant increase ( $p < 0.05$ ) was found in peak concentric knee angular velocity at 30 s (3.1  
8  
9 401 ± 1.4%), 4 min (4.1 ± 1.7%), 8 min (3.2 ± 1.0%) and 12 min (3.1 ± 1.5%) and mean concentric  
10  
11 402 VL EMG activity at 30 s (28.1 ± 10.5%), 4 min (31.5 ± 11.0%), 8 min (33.4 ± 15.9%) and 12  
12  
13 403 min (27.5 ± 14.5%) compared to pre-intervention data. No changes ( $p > 0.05$ ) in mean  
14  
15 404 concentric VM (3.7 ± 8.0% to 12.7 ± 8.6%) or Glut (0.3 ± 10.4% to 7.0 ± 7.5%) EMG or peak  
16  
17 405 concentric VL (0.6 ± 5.8% to 4.5 ± 4.7%), VM (0.3 ± 5.1% to 9.2 ± 4.1%) or Glut (0.2 ± 9.2%  
18  
19 406 to 7.1 ± 7.7%) EMG were observed at any time point (see Table 4).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 408 Table 4 about here  
27  
28  
29 409

30  
31 410 Significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) correlations were observed between the change in CMJ height (pre-  
32  
33 411 intervention to 8 min post-intervention, i.e. where the greatest mean increase in jump height  
34  
35 412 occurred) and changes in peak power ( $r = 0.82$ ) during VR. No significant correlations ( $p >$   
36  
37 413 0.05) were found between change in CMJ height and changes in peak normalized RFD ( $r =$   
38  
39 414 0.27), peak knee angular velocity ( $r = -0.21$ ), mean concentric VL EMG ( $r = 0.17$ ) or peak  
40  
41 415 eccentric kinetic energy ( $r = 0.32$ ).  
42  
43  
44  
45 416

46  
47 417 **DISCUSSION**  
48

49 418 The primary aim of the present study was to assess the magnitude and time-course of changes  
50  
51 419 in countermovement vertical jump (CMJ) performance after traditional free-weight (FWR) and  
52  
53 420 variable (VR) resistance squat exercises were performed following a comprehensive task-  
54  
55 421 specific, warm-up routine. The first hypothesis can be partially accepted as the lack of change  
56  
57 422 in any measure following the FWR condition suggests that no additional benefit (i.e.  
58  
59  
60

PAP/PAPE effect) was derived from the inclusion of intense loading from FWR exercise (i.e. the conditioning activity), contrary to the improvement in jump height following the use of elastic bands. This finding contrasts those of previous studies where the performance of heavy squat lifts increased CMJ height,<sup>21,32</sup> and other literature reporting an increase in tasks including sprint running performance.<sup>33</sup> However, those previous studies either did not report the use of other warm-up activities or only included a light cardiovascular warm-up rather than a more comprehensive task-specific warm-up including progressively intense task-specific muscular contractions. The current finding of a lack of effect of a back squat conditioning activity after a comprehensive task-specific warm-up (see Figure 2) is, however, consistent with a previous report of an absence of change in vertical jump performance when dynamic warm-up exercises were employed prior to a set of back squats.<sup>17</sup> These data are indicative that a lack of a comprehensive task-specific warm-up may enable further augmentation of performance after squats were performed, but may be of limited relevance to athletes, strength trainers and recreational exercisers who would customarily perform a thorough warm-up. That is, the high-intensity conditioning activities might only increase performance when the warm-up would otherwise be insufficient to promote maximal performance. Collectively, these findings indicate that the previously reported ‘potentiating’ effects of heavy free-weight back squat exercise on subsequent CMJ performance<sup>16,21</sup> may be a consequence of study design, where the limited use of warm-up protocols provided an opportunity for further performance augmentation after the baseline tests. Furthermore, inconsistencies in PAP responses<sup>12,16,17</sup> may depend on fatigue-potential or perseveration-potential interactions and their influence on subsequent performance therefore new strategies for designing warm-up protocols and optimal recovery periods following conditioning contractions are vital in order to induce a potentiation effect.

Despite FWR squat lifts having no effect on CMJ performance, a significant increase in jump height was achieved following the VR conditioning activity at all time points (30 s, 4 min, 8 min and 12 min; see Figure 2), which suggests a prolonged ‘potentiating’ effect was evoked, i.e. post-activation performance enhancement; PAPE.<sup>9</sup> Thus, the second experimental hypothesis, that jump height would be increased following the VR intervention, can be accepted. These data are consistent with a previous study<sup>34</sup> in which box squats incorporating elastic band resistance acutely increased power output during subsequent CMJ tasks. However, in the present study it was shown that this effect can be evoked even after completion of a comprehensive task-specific warm-up, which was not included in previous studies. Although each maximal CMJ may possibly potentiate the next one, no significant improvement occurred in the FWR condition, therefore these jumps were unlikely to explain the increased performance in VR. Previous studies showed that only seconds or a few minutes are needed to recover from a short bout of maximal-effort exercise (e.g. less than 1 min for recovery from a maximal squat<sup>35</sup> or bench press lifts<sup>36</sup>), thus it is unlikely that fatigue is a factor influencing the findings of the present study as a significant increase was observed across all time points. The use of elastic bands reduces the effective load near the “sticking point” in the early concentric phase of the squat lift but then allows for greater loading later in the lift as the effective mechanical advantage is increased.<sup>2</sup> The ability for muscles to operate closer to their maximum force capacity through a greater proportion of the lift may therefore enhance subsequent muscle force output and elicit a greater dynamic muscle performance (i.e. increase in CMJ height), even when a comprehensive task-specific warm-up is already completed. Collectively, these data indicate that the use of elastic bands, which alter the loading strategy during the lift, provides a more effective warm-up than either warm-up alone or warm-up that also includes traditional free-weight resistance exercises.

473 In the present study significant changes in force production (peak power and RFD; see Table  
 474 2) at all time points in the VR warm-up condition were consistent with the changes in jump  
 475 height. However, peak hip, knee and ankle, flexion angle, peak eccentric kinetic energy, the  
 476 impulse- and time-based asymmetry indexes remained unchanged and no change was detected  
 477 in  $K_{\text{vert}}$  (see Tables 2 and 3), which is consistent with previous research.<sup>30</sup> Accordingly,  
 478 changes in jump kinematics cannot explain the changes in force production or jump height.  
 479 The third hypothesis, that both kinetic and kinematic parameters would be altered by elastic  
 480 band-resisted squat lifts, can therefore only be partially accepted. The changes in peak jump  
 481 power were significantly correlated with the changes in CMJ height, however a poor  
 482 relationship was identified between changes in RFD and CMJ height. This latter finding is  
 483 consistent with a previous report<sup>37</sup> in which stretch-shortening cycle test performances were  
 484 not statistically related to RFD measured during the test. The poor relationship may be partly  
 485 explained by the participants being well strength-trained yet relatively untrained in explosive  
 486 power-based exercises, and thus unable to rapidly reach peak force.<sup>38</sup> However, further  
 487 research on power-trained athletes is needed to fully elucidate the importance of training status.  
 488  
 489 A number of mechanisms relating to stretch-shorten cycle efficiency may have contributed to  
 490 the increased jump height, including a more rapid muscle stretch resulting from force  
 491 potentiation,<sup>39,39</sup> greater elastic energy storage in the muscle,<sup>40</sup> an increased time of muscle  
 492 activation,<sup>40,41</sup> an augmented pre-load effect,<sup>42</sup> force and stiffness augmentation from stretch  
 493 reflexes,<sup>41</sup> or changes in relative contributions of muscle and tendon allowing the muscle to  
 494 operate at lower shortening speeds and over shorter distances.<sup>43</sup> Whilst it is difficult to assess  
 495 the effects of each, the peak eccentric kinetic energy and both impulse- and time-based  
 496 asymmetry indexes remained unchanged after VR, indicating that the total energy available for  
 497 storage in elastic structures (eccentric kinetic energy), the kinematic pattern adopted to make

1  
2  
3 498 use of it (asymmetry indexes),<sup>29</sup> and the time for force application and likely contribution of  
4  
5 499 stretch reflexes, were also unchanged. Nonetheless, increases in peak power and concentric  
6  
7 500 knee angular velocity were observed.  
8  
9 501  
10  
11  
12 502 Nonetheless, a more plausible explanation for the increase in force production, and thus jump  
13  
14 503 height, may be found in the increased knee extensor muscle activity detected in the concentric  
15  
16 504 phase (VL EMG increased 27.5-33.4% across time points; see Table 4). Thus, the fourth  
17  
18 505 hypothesis, that extensor muscle activity would be increased, can be accepted. The greater  
19  
20 506 increase in EMG activity in VL than VM or Glut is consistent with previous reports of greater  
21  
22 507 VL EMG in the concentric phase of a CMJ after both low- and moderate-intensity squat warm-  
23  
24 508 ups<sup>32</sup> and would likely have resulted from an increased motor unit firing frequency.<sup>44</sup> In fact,  
25  
26 509 Nikolaidou et al.<sup>45</sup> found that a greater jump height was achieved during CMJ compared to  
27  
28 510 squat jump which was consistent with an increased VL activation during the push off phase.  
29  
30 511 Increased phosphorylation of the myosin light chain leading to an increase in myofilament  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$   
31  
32 512 sensitivity and force output (i.e. classic PAP) may have contributed to the increase in CMJ,  
33  
34 513 although it resolves completely within about 5 min<sup>11</sup> thus its effect at 4 – 12 min would have  
35  
36 514 been negligible. Although other mechanisms such as increases in muscle temperature<sup>5</sup> (not  
37  
38 515 examined in the present study) may have contributed to the increase in jump height it remains  
39  
40 516 likely that the change in muscle activation was the major factor influencing the improvement  
41  
42 517 in CMJ performance. The increased muscle activity and consequent increase in peak power  
43  
44 518 output in the concentric phase would have allowed a greater jump height without changes in  
45  
46 519 kinematics or stretch-shorten cycle efficiency (i.e. without changes in eccentric knee angular  
47  
48 520 velocity, eccentric kinetic energy, impulse- and time-based asymmetry indexes or  $K_{\text{vert}}$ ). The  
49  
50 521 most likely explanation for the finding is that the variation in muscle force requirements  
51  
52 522 imposed by the use of elastic band resistance influenced muscle recruitment patterns and  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

ultimately increased concentric force output.<sup>19</sup> The current findings hint at the possibility that manipulation of loading strategies during warm-up exercises might beneficially alter muscle recruitment amplitude or timing and result in greater performances than achieved through traditional high-intensity, task-specific warm-ups alone. This hypothesis should be explicitly examined in future studies. It is important to note that it was not possible to measure muscle temperatures in the current study. However, muscle temperature would likely have increased substantially during the comprehensive task-specific warm-up so temperature may have remained constant (i.e. in an optimum zone) for a longer time, and any further small increase in temperature from the conditioning activities would have been similar between conditions. This may have allowed the improved muscle activation to result in a greater jump performance and for the increased activation to persist for a longer time. Thus, although it remains to be explicitly examined in future, it can be considered unlikely that muscle temperature differences could explain the between-condition differences in jump performance.

## PERSPECTIVE

The completion of brief, high-load free-weight squat exercise following a comprehensive task-specific warm-up failed to alter CMJ height, force/power production or movement pattern. These findings are suggestive that the previously-observed ‘potentiating’ effect of squat exercise may be a consequence of limited warm-up. The beneficial effect of a free-weight squat strategy to potentiate the system may therefore, be minimal in athletic populations that typically perform high-intensity, task-specific warm-up routines prior to maximal exercise tasks. However, the use of elastic band resistance during these squats resulted in significant increases in jump height, peak power, peak concentric knee angular velocity and peak RFD, as well as increased VL EMG activity in the concentric (propulsive) phase of the jump, which did not return to baseline after 12 min despite a comprehensive task-specific warm-up being

1  
2  
3 548 completed. The results suggest that the inclusion of tasks in which force-time parameters differ  
4  
5 549 from the outcome task (CMJ in the current study) might evoke positive acute adaptations in  
6  
7 550 addition to those achieved through warm-up alone. Further research is required to determine  
8  
9 551 whether similar effects are observed following different warm-up strategies and in different  
10  
11 552 athletic tasks, as well as in other populations.  
12  
13  
14  
15 553

16  
17 554 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**  
18

19 555 No funding was received for this work. No conflicts of interest exist.  
20  
21  
22 556  
23  
24 557  
25  
26 558  
27  
28 559  
29  
30 560  
31  
32 561  
33  
34 562  
35  
36 563  
37  
38 564  
39  
40 565  
41  
42 566  
43  
44 567  
45  
46 568  
47  
48 569  
49  
50 570  
51  
52 571  
53  
54 572  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

PROOF



**REFERENCES**

1. Tillin NA, Bishop D. Factors modulating post-activation potentiation and its effect on performance on subsequent explosive activities. *Sports Med* 2009;39:147–166.
2. Mina MA, Blazevich AJ, Giakas G, Kay AD. The influence of variable resistance loading on subsequent free-weight maximal back squat performance. *J Strength Cond Res* 2014;28:2988–2996.
3. Woods K, Bishop P, Jones E. Warm-up and stretching in the prevention of muscular injury. *Sports Med* 2007;37:1089–1099.
4. Hodgson M, Docherty D, Robbins D. Post activation potentiation: Underlying physiology and implication for motor performance. *Sports Med* 2005;35:585–595.
5. Racinais S, Oksa J. Temperature and neuromuscular function. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2010;20:11–18.
6. Moore RL, Stull JT. Myosin light chain phosphorylation in fast and slow skeletal muscles in situ. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol* 1984;247:462–471.
7. Trimble MH, Harp SS. Postexercise potentiation of the H-reflex in human. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1998;30:933–941.
8. Hamada T, Sale DG, MacDougall JD, Tarnopolsky MA. Postactivation potentiation, fibre type and twitch contraction time in human knee extensor muscles. *J Appl Physiol* 2000;88:2131–2137.
9. Cuenca-Fernandez F, Smith IC, Jordan MJ, et al. Nonlocalized postactivation performance enhancement (PAPE) effects in trained athletes: a pilot study. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2017;42:1122–1125.
10. Jo E, Judelson DA, Brown LE, Coburn JW, Dabbs NC. Influence of recovery duration after a potentiating stimulus on muscular power in recreationally trained individuals. *J Strength Cond Res* 2010;24:343–347.

- 598 11. MacIntosh BR, Robillard ME, Tomaras EK. Should postactivation potentiation be the goal  
599 of your warm-up? *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2012;37:546–550.
- 600 12. Young WB, Jenner A, Griffiths K. Acute enhancement of power performance from heavy  
601 load squats. *J Strength Cond Res* 1998;12:82–84.
- 602 13. Arabatzi F, Patikas D, Zafeiridis A, et al. The post-activation potentiation effect on squat  
603 jump performance: Age and sex effect. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 2014;26:187–194.
- 604 14. Baker DG. Increase in jump squat peak external power output when combined with  
605 accommodating resistance box squats during contrasting resistance complex training with  
606 short rest periods. *J Aust Strength Cond* 2008;6:10–18.
- 607 15. Wilson JM, Duncan NM, Marin PJ, et al. Meta-analysis of post activation potentiation and  
608 power: Effect of conditioning activity, volume, gender, rest periods, and training status. *J*  
609 *Strength Cond Res* 2013;27:854–859.
- 610 16. Gourgoulis V, Aggeloussis N, Kasimatis P, Mavromatis G, Garas A. Effect of a  
611 submaximal half-squats warm-up program on vertical jumping ability. *J Strength Cond*  
612 *Res* 2003;17:342–344.
- 613 17. Witmer CA, Davis SE, Moir GL. The acute effects of back squats on vertical jump  
614 performance in men and women. *J Sports Sci Med* 2010;9:206–213.
- 615 18. Elliott BC, Wilson GJ. A biomechanical analysis of the sticking region in the bench press.  
616 *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1989;21:450–462.
- 617 19. Israetel MA, McBride JM, Nuzzo JL, Skinner JD, Dayne AM. Kinetic and kinematic  
618 difference between squat performed with and without elastic bands. *J Strength Cond Res*  
619 2010;24:190–194.
- 620 20. Wallace BJ, Winchester JB, McGuigan MR. Effects of elastic bands on force and power  
621 characteristics during the back squat exercise. *J Strength Cond Res* 2006;20:268–272.

- 1  
2  
3 622 21. Lowery RP, Duncan NM, Loenneke JP, et al. The effects of potentiating stimuli intensity  
4  
5 623 under varying rest periods on vertical jump performance and power. *J Strength Cond Res*  
6  
7 624 2012;26:3320–3325.  
8  
9  
10 625 22. Mina MA, Blazeovich AJ, Giakas G, Seitz LB, Kay AD. Chain-loaded variable resistance  
11  
12 626 warm-up improves free-weight maximal back squat performance. *Eur J Sport Sci*  
13  
14 627 2016;16:932–939.  
15  
16  
17 628 23. Golas A, Wilk M, Stastny P, Maszczyk A, Pajerska K, Zajac A. Optimizing half squat  
18  
19 629 postactivation potential load in squat jump training for eliciting relative maximal power in  
20  
21 630 ski jumpers. *J Strength Cond Res* 2017;31:3010–3017.  
22  
23  
24 631 24. Sheppard JM, Triplett NT. Program design for resistance training. In: Haff GG, Triplett  
25  
26 632 NT, ed. *Essentials of strength training and conditioning*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Champaign: Human  
27  
28 633 Kinetics; 2016. 452-456 p.  
29  
30  
31 634 25. Kilduff LP, Bevan HR, Kingsley MIC, et al. Post activation potentiation in professional  
32  
33 635 rugby players: Optimal recovery. *J Strength Cond Res* 2007;21:1134–1138.  
34  
35  
36 636 26. Woltring HJ. A fortan package for generalized cross-validatory spline smoothing and  
37  
38 637 differentiation. *Adv Eng Softw* 1986;8:104–113.  
39  
40  
41 638 27. Davis III RB, Ounpuu S, Tyburski D, Gage JR. A gait analysis data collection and  
42  
43 639 reduction technique. *Hum Mov Sci* 1991;10:575–587.  
44  
45  
46 640 28. Kibele A. Possibilities and limitations in biomechanical analysis of countermovement  
47  
48 641 jumps: a methodological study. *J Appl Biomech* 1998;14:105–117.  
49  
50  
51 642 29. Cavagna GA. Storage and utilization of elastic energy in skeletal muscle. *Exerc Sport Sci*  
52  
53 643 *Rev* 1977;5:89–129.  
54  
55  
56 644 30. Boullosa DA, Abreu L, Beltrame LG, Behm DG. The acute effect of different half squat  
57  
58 645 set configurations on jump potentiation. *J Strength Cond Res* 2013;27:2059-2066.  
59  
60 646 31. Cavagna GA. Force platforms as ergometers. *J Appl Physiol* 1985;39:174-179.

- 647 32. Sotiropoulos K, Smilios I, Christou M, et al. Effect of warm-up on vertical jump  
648 performance and muscle electrical activity using half-squats and moderate intensity. *J*  
649 *Sports Sci Med* 2010;9:326–331.
- 650 33. Chatzopoulos DE, Michailidis CJ, Giannakos AK, et al. Postactivation potentiation effects  
651 after heavy resistance exercise on running speed. *J Strength Cond Res* 2007;21:1278–  
652 1281.
- 653 34. Buttifant D, Hrysomallis C. Effect of various practical warm-up protocols on acute lower-  
654 body power. *J Strength Cond Res* 2015;29:656–660.
- 655 35. Hitchcock HC. Recovery of short-term power after dynamic exercise. *J Appl Physiol*  
656 1987;67:677-681.
- 657 36. Matuszak ME, Fry AC, Weiss LW, Ireland TR, McKnight MM. Effect of rest interval  
658 length on repeated 1 repetition maximum back squat. *J Strength Cond Res* 2003;17:634-  
659 637.
- 660 37. Wilson G, Lyttle A, Ostrowski K, Murphy A. Assessing dynamic performance: A  
661 comparison of rate of force development tests. *J Strength Cond Res* 1995;9:176–181.
- 662 38. Moir G, Sanders R, Button C, Glaister M. The influence of familiarization on the reliability  
663 of force variables measured during unloaded and loaded vertical jumps. *J Strength Cond*  
664 *Res* 2005;19:140–145.
- 665 39. Rassier DE, Herzog W. Considerations on the history dependence on muscle contraction.  
666 *J Appl Physiol* 2004;96:419–427.
- 667 40. Finni T, Ikegawa S, Lepola V, Komi PV. Comparison of force-velocity relationships of  
668 vastus lateralis muscle in isokinetic and in stretch-shortening cycle exercises. *Acta Physiol*  
669 *Scan* 2003;177:483–491.
- 670 41. Bobbert MF, Gerritsen KGM, Litjens MCA, van Soest AJ. Why is countermovement jump  
671 height greater than squat jump height? *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1996;28:1402–1412.

- 1  
2  
3 672 42. Finni T, Ikegawa S, Komi PV. Concentric force enhancement during human movement.  
4  
5 673 Acta Physiol Scan 2001;173:369–377.  
6  
7  
8 674 43. Hill AV. The heat of shortening and the dynamic constants of the muscle. Proc R Soc B  
9  
10 675 Biol Sci 1938;843:136–195.  
11  
12 676 44. Heckman CJ, Enoka RM. Motor Unit. Compr Physiol 2012;2:2629–2682.  
13  
14  
15 677 45. Nikolaidou ME, Marzilger SB, Mersmann F, Arampatzis A. Operating length and velocity  
16  
17 678 of human M. vastus lateralis fascicles during vertical jumping. R Soc Open Sci  
18  
19 679 2017;4:170185.  
20  
21  
22 680  
23  
24  
25 681  
26  
27  
28 682  
29  
30  
31 683  
32  
33  
34 684  
35  
36  
37 685  
38  
39  
40 686  
41  
42  
43 687  
44  
45  
46 688  
47  
48  
49 689  
50  
51  
52 690  
53  
54  
55 691  
56  
57  
58 692  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**TABLE AND FIGURE LEGENDS**

**Table 1.** Study design timeline. Acronyms: CMJ = countermovement vertical jump; FWR = free-weight resistance; VR = variable resistance.

**Table 2.** Kinetic measures of vertical jump performance across all time points following the free-weight resistance and elastic band warm-up conditions (values are reported as mean  $\pm$  SE;  $*p < 0.05$  compared to pre-intervention and FWR condition). Acronyms: Pre = pre-intervention; FWR = free-weight resistance; VR = variable resistance;  $K_{\text{vert}}$  = vertical stiffness; RFD = rate of force development.

**Table 3.** Kinematic measures of vertical jump performance across all time points following the free-weight resistance and elastic band warm-up conditions (values are reported as mean  $\pm$  SE;  $*p < 0.05$  compared to pre-intervention). Acronyms: Pre = pre-intervention; FWR = free-weight resistance; VR = variable resistance; ECC = eccentric; CON = concentric.

**Table 4.** Normalized mean and peak VL, VM and Glut EMG amplitudes measured during vertical jumps across all time points following free-weight resistance and elastic band warm-up squat conditions (values are reported as mean  $\pm$  SE;  $*p < 0.05$  compared to pre-intervention and FWR condition). Acronyms: VL = vastus lateralis; VM = vastus medialis; Glut = gluteus maximum; EMG = electromyogram; MVC = maximum voluntary contraction; FWR = free-weight resistance; VR = variable resistance; ECC = eccentric; CON = concentric.

**Figure 1.** Exemplar data from a subject depicting CMJ height, ground reaction force, knee angular velocity, knee flexion angle and VL EMG activity at 8 min following the free-weight resistance and elastic band warm-up squat conditions. VL = vastus lateralis; CMJ = countermovement vertical jump; FWR = free-weight resistance; VR = variable resistance.

**Figure 2.** Mean countermovement vertical jump height following free-weight resistance and elastic band warm-up squat conditions. \*Significant increases (5.3-6.5%;  $p < 0.05$ ) in vertical jump performance were achieved across all time points following the VR warm-up condition compared to pre-intervention and the FWR warm-up condition. Pre = pre-intervention; FWR = free-weight resistance; VR = variable resistance.

**Table 1.** Study design timeline.

Task	Time (min)
5-min cycle	0-5.0
5 unloaded squats (1 s/ 1 s)	5.0-6.0
5 unloaded squats (2 s/ 2 s)	6.0-7.0
5 CMJs (70%)	7.5-8.5
Single CMJs every 30 s (100%)	9.0-11.0
CMJ Test 1	13.0-13.5
FWR or VR squats	14.5-15.0
CMJ Tests (2-5)	15.5, 19.5, 23.5, 27.5

Acronyms: CMJ = countermovement vertical jump; FWR = free-weight resistance; VR = variable resistance.



**Table 2.** Kinetic measures of vertical jump performance across all time points following the free-weight and variable resistance warm-up conditions (values are reported as mean  $\pm$  SE; \* $p < 0.05$  compared to pre-intervention and FWR condition).

Measure	Condition	Pre	30 s	4 min	8 min	12 min
Peak Power (W)	FWR	49.3 $\pm$ 1.9	50.3 $\pm$ 1.5	50.8 $\pm$ 1.7	49.2 $\pm$ 2.2	50.3 $\pm$ 1.7
	VR	49.0 $\pm$ 1.7	51.3 $\pm$ 1.8*	51.8 $\pm$ 1.6*	51.0 $\pm$ 1.7*	51.2 $\pm$ 1.7*
Peak Eccentric Kinetic Energy (J)	FWR	87.4 $\pm$ 7.7	95.8 $\pm$ 9.0	90.8 $\pm$ 9.4	90.3 $\pm$ 7.7	88.0 $\pm$ 9.0
	VR	94.3 $\pm$ 8.0	93.6 $\pm$ 7.3	87.9 $\pm$ 7.2	88.8 $\pm$ 6.9	82.4 $\pm$ 5.9
Impulse asymmetry index (N·s)	FWR	2.9 $\pm$ 0.1	2.8 $\pm$ 0.1	2.9 $\pm$ 0.1	2.9 $\pm$ 0.1	2.9 $\pm$ 0.1
	VR	2.8 $\pm$ 0.1	2.9 $\pm$ 0.1	2.9 $\pm$ 0.1	2.9 $\pm$ 0.1	2.9 $\pm$ 0.1
Time asymmetry index (ms)	FWR	1.5 $\pm$ 0.1	1.4 $\pm$ 0.2	1.5 $\pm$ 0.2	1.3 $\pm$ 0.2	1.2 $\pm$ 0.2
	VR	1.4 $\pm$ 0.2	1.5 $\pm$ 0.2	1.1 $\pm$ 0.2	1.4 $\pm$ 0.2	1.2 $\pm$ 0.2
$K_{\text{vert}}$ (N·m <sup>-1</sup> ·kg <sup>-1</sup> )	FWR	70.8 $\pm$ 6.0	72.6 $\pm$ 3.8	70.5 $\pm$ 3.6	69.0 $\pm$ 3.7	72.0 $\pm$ 3.8
	VR	69.9 $\pm$ 5.0	73.3 $\pm$ 3.9	73.5 $\pm$ 4.5	74.6 $\pm$ 3.7	74.4 $\pm$ 4.5
Peak normalized RFD (N·s <sup>-1</sup> )	FWR	134.2 $\pm$ 11.3	147.1 $\pm$ 12.2	132.5 $\pm$ 10.8	141.8 $\pm$ 13.5	118.2 $\pm$ 7.5
	VR	126.1 $\pm$ 6.7	149.8 $\pm$ 12.8*	143.2 $\pm$ 11.7*	149.2 $\pm$ 9.0*	147.7 $\pm$ 13.7*

Acronyms: Pre = pre-intervention; FWR = free-weight resistance; VR = variable resistance;  $K_{\text{vert}}$  = vertical stiffness; RFD = rate of force development.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 3.** Kinematic measures of vertical jump performance across all time points following the free-weight and variable resistance warm-up conditions (values are reported as mean ± SE; \**p* < 0.05 compared to pre-intervention).


Measure	Mode	Condition	Pre	30 s	4 min	8 min	12 min
Peak hip angular velocity (°·s <sup>-1</sup> )	ECC	FWR	301.1 ± 9.5	302.2 ± 10.0	294.4 ± 9.8	291.4 ± 6.9	292.8 ± 9.2
		VR	298.2 ± 7.1	305.2 ± 8.3	300.2 ± 8.3	302.6 ± 8.8	297.3 ± 8.7
	CON	FWR	584.6 ± 15.6	605.4 ± 18.8	591.9 ± 20.2	575.7 ± 20.7	576.2 ± 15.8
		VR	572.2 ± 17.1	591.9 ± 20.2	593.0 ± 22.1	588.2 ± 19.3	580.8 ± 21.7
Peak knee angular velocity (°·s <sup>-1</sup> )	ECC	FWR	343.2 ± 13.6	341.0 ± 11.4	332.6 ± 11.9	343.8 ± 13.7	340.5 ± 14.3
		VR	352.1 ± 14.3	364.9 ± 15.7	353.5 ± 13.9	363.0 ± 15.0	347.5 ± 16.6
	CON	FWR	956.4 ± 23.6	971.6 ± 24.6	969.3 ± 26.7	939.6 ± 27.9	959.6 ± 25.1
		VR	937.0 ± 23.8	966.0 ± 28.8*	975.7 ± 29.7*	966.9 ± 26.2*	964.2 ± 24.5*
Peak ankle angular velocity (°·s <sup>-1</sup> )	ECC	FWR	108.1 ± 10.0	117.6 ± 12.0	109.7 ± 12.2	112.0 ± 10.9	114.4 ± 10.8
		VR	121.1 ± 12.8	118.7 ± 9.8	120.3 ± 9.0	112.8 ± 7.1	104.5 ± 5.0
	CON	FWR	745.4 ± 23.4	733.7 ± 25.5	728.2 ± 18.9	707.9 ± 25.3	721.5 ± 27.0
		VR	717.9 ± 21.3	723.6 ± 22.2	731.7 ± 23.6	735.1 ± 28.1	739.4 ± 19.1
Peak hip flexion angle (°)		FWR	79.3 ± 2.0	82.7 ± 2.1	81.8 ± 1.7	82.1 ± 2.4	81.8 ± 2.2
		VR	81.5 ± 1.9	83.2 ± 1.4	83.3 ± 1.9	83.4 ± 1.5	82.8 ± 1.5
Peak knee flexion angle (°)		FWR	71.7 ± 2.9	73.3 ± 3.0	71.1 ± 2.8	72.0 ± 2.7	71.9 ± 3.3
		VR	71.8 ± 3.5	72.6 ± 3.4	74.2 ± 3.3	75.2 ± 2.8	75.4 ± 3.5
Peak ankle flexion angle (°)		FWR	32.7 ± 1.6	32.6 ± 1.4	32.7 ± 1.4	33.0 ± 1.4	33.2 ± 1.4
		VR	33.8 ± 1.6	34.7 ± 1.6	34.8 ± 1.6	35.2 ± 1.6	34.8 ± 1.8

Acronyms: Pre = pre-intervention; FWR = free-weight resistance; VR = variable resistance; ECC = eccentric; CON = concentric.


**Table 4.** Normalized mean and peak VL, VM and Glut EMG amplitudes measured during vertical jumps across all time points following free-weight and variable resistance warm-up squat conditions (values are reported as mean  $\pm$  SE; \* $p < 0.05$  compared to pre-intervention and FWR condition).

Measure	Mode	Condition	Pre	30 s	4 min	8 min	12 min
Mean VL EMG (%MVC)	ECC	FWR	31.9 $\pm$ 2.1	31.5 $\pm$ 3.4	30.5 $\pm$ 3.0	30.0 $\pm$ 2.0	29.5 $\pm$ 2.9
		VR	28.5 $\pm$ 2.1	30.2 $\pm$ 2.2	31.9 $\pm$ 2.3	31.5 $\pm$ 1.8	32.0 $\pm$ 2.2
	CON	FWR	82.4 $\pm$ 6.1	83.9 $\pm$ 6.4	78.4 $\pm$ 8.5	72.5 $\pm$ 4.6	73.4 $\pm$ 6.0
		VR	85.4 $\pm$ 7.8	108.2 $\pm$ 13.3*	110.2 $\pm$ 12.2*	107.5 $\pm$ 10.5*	102.6 $\pm$ 9.4*
Peak VL EMG (%MVC)	ECC	FWR	89.2 $\pm$ 6.7	94.7 $\pm$ 8.0	90.4 $\pm$ 6.9	85.0 $\pm$ 6.7	84.0 $\pm$ 6.0
		VR	91.6 $\pm$ 4.9	95.0 $\pm$ 8.0	94.2 $\pm$ 6.1	90.7 $\pm$ 4.7	90.6 $\pm$ 5.9
	CON	FWR	112.4 $\pm$ 8.0	123.7 $\pm$ 9.6	116.9 $\pm$ 7.1	112.8 $\pm$ 6.7	112.2 $\pm$ 6.3
		VR	114.3 $\pm$ 5.8	115.8 $\pm$ 10.2	117.4 $\pm$ 7.6	111.2 $\pm$ 6.6	108.1 $\pm$ 6.6
Mean VM EMG (%MVC)	ECC	FWR	36.3 $\pm$ 2.7	33.9 $\pm$ 4.1	32.6 $\pm$ 3.3	32.2 $\pm$ 2.6	33.0 $\pm$ 3.4
		VR	37.9 $\pm$ 3.8	40.2 $\pm$ 3.8	38.1 $\pm$ 3.3	39.9 $\pm$ 2.9	38.1 $\pm$ 3.3
	CON	FWR	94.9 $\pm$ 5.0	95.3 $\pm$ 10.9	85.1 $\pm$ 8.4	85.1 $\pm$ 6.4	87.7 $\pm$ 7.3
		VR	90.2 $\pm$ 9.2	96.0 $\pm$ 7.9	94.7 $\pm$ 7.5	88.8 $\pm$ 5.9	87.2 $\pm$ 6.2
Peak VM EMG (%MVC)	ECC	FWR	98.6 $\pm$ 7.9	96.9 $\pm$ 7.4	92.9 $\pm$ 6.7	88.0 $\pm$ 6.1	89.0 $\pm$ 6.1
		VR	111.3 $\pm$ 9.5	114.4 $\pm$ 11.2	108.1 $\pm$ 10.2	104.7 $\pm$ 8.1	97.3 $\pm$ 6.7
	CON	FWR	132.0 $\pm$ 12.2	128.7 $\pm$ 11.5	120.5 $\pm$ 9.5	118.2 $\pm$ 8.6	118.8 $\pm$ 9.1
		VR	150.6 $\pm$ 12.8	149.0 $\pm$ 14.4	143.4 $\pm$ 12.5	140.8 $\pm$ 11.8	127.7 $\pm$ 8.9
Mean Glut EMG (%MVC)	ECC	FWR	20.0 $\pm$ 1.9	22.4 $\pm$ 2.8	21.3 $\pm$ 2.3	19.7 $\pm$ 1.7	21.2 $\pm$ 1.9
		VR	21.7 $\pm$ 2.5	23.2 $\pm$ 2.6	22.5 $\pm$ 2.4	22.5 $\pm$ 2.2	21.7 $\pm$ 2.0
	CON	FWR	81.1 $\pm$ 10.2	84.4 $\pm$ 14.8	83.9 $\pm$ 12.1	78.6 $\pm$ 8.7	75.1 $\pm$ 9.2
		VR	84.4 $\pm$ 14.0	87.1 $\pm$ 14.2	78.3 $\pm$ 10.1	77.4 $\pm$ 8.5	76.8 $\pm$ 9.8
Peak Glut EMG (%MVC)	ECC	FWR	72.6 $\pm$ 7.0	78.3 $\pm$ 7.5	76.4 $\pm$ 7.2	74.6 $\pm$ 7.1	71.7 $\pm$ 6.9
		VR	79.1 $\pm$ 9.4	82.0 $\pm$ 9.5	76.7 $\pm$ 8.9	74.7 $\pm$ 5.5	71.7 $\pm$ 7.3
	CON	FWR	103.4 $\pm$ 10.8	111.3 $\pm$ 14.0	112.7 $\pm$ 12.5	103.3 $\pm$ 12.1	103.1 $\pm$ 9.6
		VR	115.9 $\pm$ 9.9	118.5 $\pm$ 10.7	110.8 $\pm$ 11.7	100.3 $\pm$ 7.9	99.7 $\pm$ 7.6

Acronyms: VL = vastus lateralis; VM = vastus medialis; Glut = gluteus maximum; EMG = electromyogram; MVC = maximum voluntary contraction; FWR = free-weight resistance; VR = variable resistance; ECC = eccentric; CON = concentric.



300x500mm (96 x 96 DPI)



250x200mm (96 x 96 DPI)